

Attachment to Comment Set 10

Thomas K. Butt, Councilmember



June 7, 2000

Mr. Paul Thayer
Executive Officer
California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Ave. - Suite 100 South
Sacramento, CA 95825-8202

Subject: Lease of subtidal lands in San Francisco Bay for the Chevron Long Wharf

Dear Mr. Thayer:

The State Lands Commission is presently considering renewal of a lease of sub tidal land in San Francisco Bay to Chevron USA for use in conjunction with its long wharf tanker terminal. This 30-year lease is currently under CEQA review.

The property over which the wharf extends is public property, intended for the use, benefit and enjoyment of the public. Chevron's use excludes the public from this property, and it causes a negative visual impairment of the public's enjoyment of the Bay. As a Richmond city council member and a 27 year resident of Richmond, I have been aware of these environmental concerns and I feel strongly that these impacts should be mitigated.

The Chevron Refinery poses the only impediment to completion of the Bay Trail in Richmond's 32 miles of shoreline. While portions of the refinery pose formidable challenges to completing the Bay Trail adjacent to the shoreline, the Long Wharf is different. The Bay Trail route passes through public lands and dedicated streets on either side of the Long Wharf. There are obvious engineering solutions to joining these links across the Long Wharf via tunnels, bridges and/or fenced rights of way that will provide safety for the users while preserving Chevron's security. I have personally walked these routes with Chevron officials in the past and received their acknowledgement that the necessary improvements are reasonable and practical.

This Bay Trail route has long been a part of the Richmond General Plan as well as the East Bay Regional Park District and ABAG plans for regional trails. I fully support a mitigation requiring a public access hiking and biking trail across Chevron property upland from, and adjacent to, the leased property, such that the public and communities to the south would have non-vehicular access to the Point San Pablo peninsula to the North. I believe this is an appropriate mitigation for the following reasons:

- 1) The northern half of the San Pablo Peninsula currently provides shoreline public recreational opportunities and, as envisioned in the Point San Pablo Peninsula Open

2600 Barrett Ave. P.O. Box 4046 Richmond California 94804
Home: 510 237-2084
Fax: 510 232-5325

Office: 510 236-7435
Email: tom.butt@intres.com